

## **CITY OF BELMONT**

### **PLANNING COMMISSION**

#### **ACTION MINUTES**

**TUESDAY, JANUARY 15, 2008, 7:00 PM**

Chair Parsons called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. at One Twin Pines Lane, City Hall Council Chambers.

#### **1. ROLL CALL**

Commissioners Present: Parsons, Frautschi, Horton, Mayer, Mercer  
Commissioners Absent: McKenzie

Staff Present: Community Development Director de Melo (CDD), SP DiDonato, Assistant Planner Walker (AP), Associate Planner Gill (AP), CP Knapp-Wollman (CP), City Attorney Zafferano (CA), Recording Secretary Flores (RS)

#### **2. AGENDA AMENDMENTS**

CDD de Melo asked that item 7C be discussed at the conclusion of Item 5C, Old Business.

#### **3. COMMUNITY FORUM (Public Comments) - None**

#### **4. CONSENT CALENDAR**

##### **4A. Minutes of November 7, 2007**

MOTION: By Vice Chair Frautschi, seconded by Commissioner Horton, to accept the Minutes of November 7, 2007 as presented. Commissioner Mercer asked that Item 6D, NDNU (Koret) Athletic Field, be corrected to indicate that she exited the room because she has financial ties with the University, rather than because she lives within 500'.

Ayes: Frautschi, Horton, Mayer, Mercer, Parsons  
Noes: None  
Absent: McKenzie

Motion passed 5/0/1

##### **4B. Minutes of December 4, 2007**

MOTION: By Vice Chair Frautschi, seconded by Commissioner Mayer, to accept the Minutes of December 4, 2007 as presented.

Ayes: Frautschi, Mayer, Mercer, Parsons  
Noes: None  
Abstain: Horton  
Absent: McKenzie

Motion passed 4/0/1/1

#### **5. OLD BUSINESS**

5A. Extension of Approvals – 905 South Road

SP DiDonato summarized the staff memorandum.

Mr. Graves made a brief statement.

Responding to Commissioner Mercer's request regarding Planning Division Condition of Approval 6, SP DiDonato confirmed that all of the required reports or plans have been submitted and checked by Public Works and the City's consulting Geologist, and have been found to be sufficient.

MOTION: By Vice Chair Frautschi, seconded by Commissioner Horton, adopting the Resolution approving an extension of a Variance and Single-Family Design Review for 905 South Road (Appl. No. 2002-0061) with Exhibit A, Conditions of Project Approval.

Ayes: Frautschi, Horton, Mayer, Mercer, Parsons  
Noes: None  
Absent: McKenzie

Motion passed 5/0/1

Chair Parsons announced that this item may be appealed to City Council within 10 calendar days.

5B. Revised Resolution – Single Family Design Review - 2612 Hallmark Drive

AP Walker summarized the staff memorandum, noting that she had distributed the following revised Conditions of Approval after preparation of the memorandum:

Item I.A.8. – Add the following sentence: "Should it be determined that Geofoam cannot be used at this project site, the project would return to the Planning Commission for a final revised grading plan."

Condition 9 – "Prior to receiving a Building Final or Certificate of Occupancy, the applicant/developer shall have a statement recorded on the property deed for 2612 Hallmark that documents the use of Geofoam fill for the development of the single-family residence."

Regarding Condition I.A.8., Commissioner Mercer asked what criteria would be applied to the Geofoam to determine that it would not be usable. AP Walker responded that the decision will be mainly up to the Public Works Engineering and City Arborist, adding that staff's search of the Internet did not raise any red flags that encouraged them not to move forward. They, however, would like to have another example of the material being used locally for a residential project, and concurred that there is no bar that they are requiring the applicant to exceed in order to qualify.

Judd Iverson, resident of Soho Circle, was concerned that damage could be done to the canyon, the animals and the flora and fauna. He believed that they are making decisions before they have a basic study of the Geofoam product, and felt that they should assure that it is acceptable before they issue the final grading permit.

Chair Parsons asked for clarification for the record that the proposal in the Conditions of Approval was that the appropriateness of the material will be determined before any permits are issued. CDD de Melo responded that the condition reads that "...the applicant shall submit appropriate documentation supporting the use of Geofoam in a residential development." If information is received that the material is not acceptable, then that condition will not have been satisfied and it will default to the last sentence and it shall not be used. He noted that the Commission is looking at a revised grading plan just as they would a revised landscape plan, and that the only entitlement is for a Single-Family Design Review.

Krista Kuehnhackl, resident of Wakefield Drive, spoke in opposition to use of Geofoam, quoting from several documents to substantiate her fear that this product poses a risk to the environment and is highly flammable. She also felt that the entire City should be notified of this project rather than just the affected parties.

Morton Frank, applicant, addressed the Commission, noting that no permits will be issued until staff is satisfied that the product is acceptable. He stated that a Styrofoam insulating block/concrete form below ground has been used for many years satisfactorily all over the country, and that the Geofoam, like any other material that they would propose, is going to be scrutinized by staff, and that no permits will be issued until staff is satisfied that technically the product is acceptable.

Vice Chair Frautschi felt that residential is not the only criteria for use of the Geofoam; others are geological sensitivity, especially in this slide-prone area, and evidence that this material can degrade if it comes in contact with PVC. He will be voting against the project.

Chair Parsons was concerned that they need to set the bar high enough so that they know they are getting a clear-cut answer and that the burden should be permanently on the applicant to provide data that supports the safety of this issue. Since this is the first such project for Belmont, he wants to be sure that they do not do something that the City may regret later down the line. He asked for language that would put more emphasis on this and raise the bar.

CA Zafferano pointed out that the Commission's purview at this meeting was to approve a Single-Family Design Review with revised Conditions of Approval. He added that there are only a few conditions in the City's ordinances that relate to grading, one of which is listed on page 4 of staff report; it is not a Condition of Approval that the Planning Commission certifies that each and every material that is used in the house is environmentally benign. There is a condition that relates to grading and the question is where that review should occur. The burden should be on the applicant to provide that information but otherwise it will be provided as approval of the grading permit. Tonight's action is a Design Review with sufficient Conditions of Approval so that they are satisfied that staff will make the decisions when the time comes. Responding to Commissioner Mayer's question, he added that if the approval does not come through, it would mean that a Condition was not satisfied and it would come back to the Commission for a revision of the Conditions of Approval.

Chair Parsons for the record stated that possibly had they known this at the beginning of the project it would have had an impact on their decision upfront. He asked that as part of staff's review, they contact the California EPA to get their opinion on the appropriateness of using this material under houses. CA Zafferano stated that the Commission could add a condition that it should be the applicant's responsibility to provide that information and staff can then evaluate it and retain their own consultants to evaluate it if necessary.

Mr. Frank felt that there are certain areas where the Commission has purview and where they do not, and believed that it is the purview of staff on how they should proceed. He will be happy to respond to professional comments and demands by staff and is totally prepared to do that.

CA Zafferano clarified that Finding D reads that "All proposed grading and site preparation have been adequately reviewed to protect against site stability and ground movement hazards, erosion and flooding potential, and habitat and stream degradation." That particular item that has been raised and is in the Commission's purview – the only issue is how and when it gets addressed, not whether it gets addressed.

Chair Parsons commented that he believed the Commission had agreed that it should get addressed upfront.

Commissioner Mercer stated for the record that she will be voting "no" and that her concerns are: 1) Use of an unproven product. The City should not treat the product as innocent until proven guilty but guilty until proven innocent. 2) Cannot make the finding for bulk as it is actually the shell of a 3800 or 3900 sq.ft. house. 3) Grading and total fill.

Vice Chair Frautschi said that the bulk issue was a close call for him - there was no reduction in bulk or hardscape and there was a misstatement that staff had supported it outright from the beginning. He added that the Commission has had to deal with personal attacks from consultants on this project.

CDD de Melo proposed the addition of the following sentence after the first sentence in Condition I.A.8: "Such documentation shall clearly confirm that the use of the Geofoam material shall not contribute to habitat and stream degradation adjacent to the property." The project would come back to the Commission relative to a revised grading plan and that condition would not be satisfied.

MOTION: By Commissioner Horton, seconded by Commissioner Mayer, to adopt the Resolution approving a Single-Family Design Review for 2612 Hallmark Drive (Appl. No. 2007-0018), with attached Conditions of Project Approval as amended, including what was formally and informally amended tonight.

Ayes: Horton, Mayer, Parsons  
Noes: Mercer, Frautschi  
Absent: McKenzie

Motion passed 3/2/1

CDD de Melo confirmed that this item may be appealed to City Council within 10 calendar days.

#### 5C. Modifications to Approved Plans – 900 South Road

AP Gill summarized the staff memorandum, recommending that the Commission approve the modifications to the approved rear elevation plan only and that the previously approved Single-Family Design Review resolution and conditions remain in effect.

Commissioner Horton confirmed with staff that the designer submitting these plans was not the original designer.

Paymon Ghafouri, owner, addressed the Commission, stating that the fake balcony over the garage is already there and that after they looked at the finished frame they found that they would like to have a balcony and a bigger window to take better advantage of the view.

Commissioner Horton stated that when the Commission reviewed the project originally there were a number of changes that they requested, and that, because of its prominent location, they thought they had made it very clear to the architect at the time to design this house so that it fit into the hillside and was something positive to look at when entering the City. Many of the things that the applicant is doing are what they had asked not to have. The change in the back is fine, but this is a house that displays itself to everybody and it needs to be what they had worked so hard to approve.

Commissioner Mercer concurred with staff that the added balconies are unnecessary. The house already has two balconies in the front; four balconies on the front of the house is unprecedented. She had no objection to the change in the back as it is not visible from the street, but strongly encouraged the applicant to take a second look at that because the room that the deck will be extending over is a heavily used room where they would want good light and an open, expansive feel. Extending a deck out over it 8' will block the view up the hillside and the daylight from the living room and will devalue the house, but it is the applicant's choice.

Vice Chair Frautschi concurred with staff's recommendation, and added that he had found the property listed for sale on the internet, and the lead line is "contractor's delight or simply finish your own custom home with your own taste." He cautioned the applicant that if he is going to resell this property as it is, his obligation is to let the people who buy it know how the City expects it to be completed.

Parsons likewise supports staff's recommendations.

MOTION: By Commissioner Horton, seconded by Commissioner Mercer, to adopt the Resolution approving a request for a Modification to the Approved Plans for 900 South Road (Appl. No. 2006-0013), which includes only the change to add the balcony at the rear elevation of the property. It does not include balconies on the front or a change to the design of the windows in the front façade.

Ayes: Horton, Mercer, Parsons  
Noes: None  
Abstain: Mayer, Frautschi  
Absent: McKenzie

Motion passed 3/0/2/1

Chair Parsons announced that this item may be appealed to City Council within 10 calendar days.

Chair Parsons declared a 5-minute break at 7:46 p.m.

#### 7C. NCNU (Koret) Athletic Field)

CA Zafferano explained in detail the process that has been used to determine which Commissioners would be able to participate in the NDNU Item 7C, necessitated because only three of the Commissioners were not conflicted on that item. The end result was that there would not be a quorum to hear that item, and, therefore, it would not be discussed. By making the announcement at this time, it would not be necessary for representatives from NDNU to stay until the end of the meeting, and any interested individuals listening at home would not need to come to the meeting. The item will be scheduled for the next agenda at which four Commissioners, who can hear the item, will be present.

#### 6. PUBLIC HEARINGS:

Commissioner Horton was recused from discussion of Item 6A.

##### 6A. PUBLIC HEARING – 1301 Ralston Avenue

To consider a Conditional Use Permit to amend the Detailed Development Plan (former Belmont Hills Hospital and Ralston Village Dementia Facility uses) to permit installation of perimeter fencing on the property and to allow a new project monument sign, gazebo, and children's play area. (Appl. No. PA 2007-0072)

APN's: 045-190-040 & 045-170-010; Zoning: PD – Planned Development

CEQA Status: Categorical Exemption per Section 15303

Applicant: Paul Mullen; Owner: Silverado Senior Living

Project Planner: Jennifer Walker, (650) 595-7453

AP Walker summarized the Staff Report, noting that the operation of the dementia care facility would continue under the guidance of and in compliance with the existing conditions of approval. Staff recommended approval.

Paul Mullin, applicant, thanked staff for their help on this project and stated the objectives of the facility. He noted that the 6' fence is the company's standard after having tried a 5' fence at another facility 10 years earlier. They found that the 5' fence still gave residents the hope they could climb it, and if they tried to do so could become injured. The fence will keep people from wandering onto Ralston or elsewhere but still allow outdoor access. The only locked door is at the main entrance, where there is always a staff member to greet visitors. The gates will have locks with key access for staff and police and fire departments.

Commissioner Mercer was concerned about the prison-like sensation of being behind the 6' iron bars that are only 5' from some windows along the north end of the eastern wing. Mr. Mullin confirmed that the whole intent of everything they do is to get away from the institutional feeling of a nursing home, and that they want to make it a place people are happy to live. Pets and caregivers' children are encouraged, which explained the play structure that is part of the project. He agreed to revisit the segment of fence referred to by Commissioner Mercer.

Chair Parsons opened the public hearing. No one came forward to speak.

MOTION: By Vice Chair Frautschi, seconded by Commissioner Mayer, to close the Public Hearing. Motion passed 4/0/1/1 by a show of hands.

Vice Chair Frautschi had no problem with the project and felt that the fence had to be approved for safety reasons. If the fence referred to by Commissioner Mercer has to be there for security reasons, he suggested that they heavily landscape it so that it looks like an arbor instead of a fence.

Commissioner Mercer encouraged staff and the applicant to revisit that one section of fence.

Chair Parsons stated that if the section of fence in question is necessary to keep someone from climbing out a window, he could approve it as it is, and suggested that they look at it from the standpoint of aesthetics for the entrance to the facility.

MOTION: By Vice Chair Frautschi, seconded by Commissioner Mayer, to adopt the Resolution approving a Conditional Use Permit to amend an approved Detailed Development Plan for 1301 Ralston Avenue (Appl. No. 2007-0072), with Exhibit A, Conditions of Project Approval, and the additional condition that a final fence design for the aforementioned area at the front left of the building as you enter the property will be determined by staff.

Ayes: Frautschi, Mayer, Mercer, Parsons

Noes: None

Recused: Horton

Absent: McKenzie

Motion passed 4/0/1/1

Chair Parsons announced that this item may be appealed to City Council within 10 calendar days.

Commissioner Horton returned to the dais.

#### 6B. PUBLIC HEARING – 2311 Cipriani Boulevard

To consider a Single Family Design Review to construct a new 3,392 square-foot single-family residence on an existing vacant lot that is below the zoning district permitted 3,500 square feet for the site. (Appl. No. 2007-0051)

APN: 044-021-190; Zoning: R-1B (Single Family Residential)

CEQA Status: Recommended Categorical Exemption per Section 15303

Applicant/Owners: Jeff and Karen Leaver

Project Planner: Jennifer Walker, (650) 595-7453

Chair Parsons noted for the record that he knows Jeff and Karen Leaver, owners and applicants of the property, and that he has never discussed this project with them other than that about 2 years previously they told him they were going to build their house on this lot, moving down the street from where they lived before. His social points with them had strictly been meeting them and seeing them in restaurants but not sitting together and having dinner.

AP Walker summarized the Staff Report, recommending approval.

Commissioner Mayer asked about the floating foundations for the decks and if there is an irrigation plan. AP Walker deferred the foundation question to the applicant, and suggested that they add a condition requiring that a landscape and irrigation plan be returned to the Commission.

Vice Chair Frautschi asked about the extensive use of Bamboo.

Chair Parsons asked for clarification if the front door and patio are adjacent to each other.

Jeff Leaver, homeowner and builder, stated that he has been a licensed contractor for over 20 years and had worked on numerous high-end projects. They agree with staff's recommendations and believe that the issue with the arborist can be resolved. The Bamboo is their personal preference as they believe that it and the Maple will grow good underneath the Oak trees. The front porch and deck are the same height, but there will be a screen or something dividing them so that one could not go from the front door and walk straight through. Regarding the floating foundation, he thought they were proposed because of the tree roots. They would require less digging than a foundation wall. He added that they are more than happy to dig around the trees by hand; they moved to Belmont because of the trees.

Responding to Commissioner Horton's question, Mr. Leaver stated that they are considering 36" box Japanese Maple trees. He added that the property is overwhelmed with Oak trees, that they would like to save as many as they can, but if they plant three for every two they take out, he was afraid it would look

like a gigantic Juniper bush in 20 years, and was hoping they could substitute the Maples for some of the Oaks. They are shorter and would help mitigate the bulk of the lower and middle part of the house. With the Oak trees, there is no greenery except for the high canopy.

Commissioner Mercer asked for more details about the exterior and asked if he had considered using the Hardy plank for the roof as well as the siding. Mr. Leaver explained that he really does not like the Hardy plank and would prefer to use real wood in dark stain or earth-tone paint, and outlined the color scheme in detail.

Chair Parsons opened the Public Hearing.

Phil Kamp, resident of Cipriani Blvd., was not able to attend the open house but wanted to express his concerns about the possible inconveniences and disturbances caused by the construction, such as dust, heavy equipment, jack hammers and diesel fumes, and asked that the builders, owners and various city officials involved do their best to minimize the impact on surrounding neighbors. In addition, the project is taking place on a blind curve and could very well be a hazard to vehicles coming around the curve.

MOTION BY: Vice Chair Frautschi, seconded by Commissioner Horton, to close the Public Hearing. Motion passed 5/0/1 by a show of hands, with Commissioner McKenzie absent.

Vice Chair Frautschi asked staff to address Mr. Kamp's concerns, particularly about what the City now does about dust, traffic control and staging. AP Walker responded that dust control is included in the Conditions of Approval. If that were to become an issue any neighbor could contact the City and appropriate measures would be taken. Planning Condition 7 requires flag persons on Cipriani Blvd. during constructions activities which require frequent vehicle movements onto and off of the site. They also included the condition that, prior to any grading activity on the property, the homeowners will notify all residents within 300' of the project site, the notification to include the proposed haul route, the staging areas for all equipment, dates and a time frame for this work as well as contact information for the construction manager, so that neighbors would have several means of contact to address any issues that come up. The City's Noise Ordinance would somewhat regulate hours of construction, and Planning Condition 2 strictly monitors hours of construction.

Mr. Leaver returned to the podium and stated that he has been a licensed contractor of quite a few years and knew what the rules are and how to follow them. He knew about wetting down the soil for dust and about the cones and flag men and the hours they are allowed to work, and added that he will do it as fast as possible so that it will not take two years.

MOTION BY: Vice Chair Frautschi, seconded by Commissioner Mayer, to adopt the Resolution approving a Single-Family Design Review for 2311 Cipriani Boulevard (Appl. No. 2007-0051), with the Exhibit A, Conditions of Project Approval, with the addition that a landscape and irrigation plan will be returned to the Planning Commission for final approval, with the inclusion of 4 Oak trees and 7 Maple trees.

Ayes: Frautschi, Mayer, Horton, Mercer, Parsons

Noes: None

Absent: McKenzie

Motion passed 5/0/1

Vice Chair Frautschi also suggested that the applicant consider using Potocarpis instead of Bamboo, which is non-invasive and does well in shade.

Chair Parsons announced that this item may be appealed to City Council within 10 calendar days.

Chair Parsons added, for benefit of the audience, that this house is a well-designed house for a hillside lot – it is stepped down the hillside, unlike others before the Commission, and that the architect had worked with the Planning staff.

Chair Parsons called for a 3-minute recess to allow viewing of the model for the following project.

6C. PUBLIC HEARING – 1000 South Road/950 Holly Road (Continued from 6/5/07 PC Meeting)

To consider recommending City Council adoption of an Initial Study and Mitigated Negative Declaration of Environmental Significance with Addendum, and to consider recommending City Council approval of a General Plan Amendment, a Conceptual Development Plan (CDP), and a rezone to establish a Planned Development (PD), a Lot Line Adjustment to merge two parcels, and a Tentative Subdivision Map to create condominium ownership. The single-family residence on 950 Holly Road would be demolished. The apartment building on 1000 South Road would be demolished. A 24-unit condominium building with 73 parking spaces is proposed to be constructed. The units are proposed to range in size 1,066 to 2,379 square feet. Four parking spaces would be provided on surface with the remaining 69 in garage structures. The maximum proposed height is 56.25 feet and the floor area ratio proposed is 1.43. (Appl. No. 2006-1088).

Current Zoning: 1000 South Road: Multi-Family Residential (R-4); Proposed Zoning: PD

Current Zoning: 950 Holly Road: Single-Family Residential (R-1A); Proposed Zoning: PD

Current General Plan Designation: 1000 South Road: High Density Residential (Rh); Proposed: Medium Density Residential (Rm); Current General Plan Designation: 950 Holly Road: Low Density Residential (Rl); Proposed: Medium Density Residential (Rm)

APN's: 045-140-400/045-140-390; CEQA Status: Mitigated Negative Declaration.

Applicant: Carol Jansen; Owner: Prospect Point Development, LLC.

Project Planner: Allison Knapp Wollam, (415) 902-3238.

CP Knapp-Wollman summarized the Staff Report, and asked that the applicant be allowed to show the Commission some of their drawings and walk them through the model.

Carol Jansen, applicant, introduced the development team: Tim Clark, owner/developer, Cliff Chang, architect, Rick Gallow, landscape architect, D. J. Edwards, civil engineer, Barry Butler, soils engineer, and Dick Williams, construction manager for Prospect Point Development. Messrs. Chang and Gallow described the project in detail, using a model, renderings and photographs to augment their presentation.

CP Knapp-Wollman and/or members of the development team responded to Commissioners' questions and concerns as follows:

- It is anticipated that the excavation could take up to four months, as opposed to two months for the original plan.
- The deepest excavation near the existing residence would be a maximum of 18' from the existing grade and tapers down to match the grade at the front of the garage.
- The Environmental Protection Agency identifies impact with respect to noise requisite to protect the public health and safety as 80 dba 24 hours a day 365 days a year. As a result, cities, including Belmont, have adopted grading, noise and construction ordinances that give them the legal right to restrict the annoyance so that it is not something that will affect one's health. Notifying neighbors of hours of construction activities, construction manager and City contact numbers, and assuring that these contacts man their telephones, is highly preferable. Staff recommended that notification be extended all the way up Holly Road and perhaps include South Road, and that schools in the area be notified. CDD de Melo interjected that the Police Department's Teleminder system could be used as a quick and easy way to provide a notice to a number of residents.
- The 15 additional parking spaces are tandem parking spaces that would be available to residents who might want to pay extra to have them. They would not be to accessible to short-term visitors unless they were buzzed in, but could be used for secure parking for long-term guests.
- They are not attempting to incorporate generation of electricity with the solar panels, are looking at the possibility for the pool, but examples so far are not attractive enough. Elevator shafts and other mechanical equipment will be hidden by the mansards on the roofs.
- The light study data is normally a Planning Division Condition of Approval. Commission Frautschi asked to see that study when it becomes available.
- Signage to direct visitors to the six visitor parking spots should be considered.
- Commissioner Frautschi expressed concern about the perspective of the design coming down Holly Road, and if the Canary Island Palms would mitigate the bulk.
- The setback on the West side at the corner along the property line where the pool building is located is 13' at the closest point.
- The hardscape will be decomposed granite and no additional hardscape such as decks or tennis courts is planned.
- Dampening mechanisms for noise from the mechanical systems on the roof are required by the 2006 Noise Ordinance and will be worked out at the DDP stage.
- They have not considered whether there will be room to implement some sort of solar paneling on the flat



area of the roof.

- Regarding Commissioner Mercer's concern that the light-colored reflective material proposed for the roof could impact the uphill neighbors, the developer stated that there are other ways they can mitigate the heat gain, such as using thicker insulation underneath the roof.
- A way to solve the problem of over-night parking needs to be addressed, presumably through the CC&R's.
- Construction traffic impacts, especially during early morning hours, needs to be taken into consideration.
- Regarding Commissioner Mayer's concern about elimination of the conservation easement, CP Knapp-Wollman stated that anybody applying for a new conditional use permit would need to go through the same process as they are going through now. If this is approved it will be the Zoning Ordinance for the planned development.

Chair Parsons opened the Public Hearing.

Mike Carter, resident of Continental Way, raised concerns about the large size of the units, the impact of solid waste disposal, negative impacts of CO<sup>2</sup> production, the possible use of fly ash, which has been reported to contain radon, and tree loss.

MOTION: By Vice Chair Frautschi, seconded by Commissioner Mayer, to close the Public Hearing. Motion passed 5/0/1 by a show of hands.

Commissioners commented as follows:

Vice Chair Frautschi:

- The developer pulled together a great team – architecture and landscaping are wonderful.
- Can accept the pool house at its current location, assuming the windows or areas of egress and ingress are incorporated into the building only on the side facing the pool.
- Supports the substantial increase in the cut and haul because it provides residential parking compliance as well as additional visitor parking.
- Appreciates the energy conservation elements, however, would like to see solar panel inclusion at a minimum to facilitate the heating of the pool and spa and possibly common area and landscape lighting.
- Enthusiastically supports the applicant's proposal to replace all of the removed trees regardless of the protected status, and believes 111 new trees is a great gain for the site.
- Thanked CP Knapp-Wollman for the wonderful Staff Report and for answering his questions regarding the loss of rental units with this move to an ownership model, and hoped that this project might lead to other such conversions benefitting Prospect Point Development, as well as the City and people of Belmont.
- In the upcoming DDP he expects to see no further hardscape proposed in the active/passive open space areas.
- He hopes that there is a formal statement in the CC&R's about the prohibition of using any of the balconies for storage or outdoor cooking.

Commissioner Horton:

- Has no issue with any of the things they will be voting on. Great project.
- Suggested that if they haven't done so, they might want to look at the traffic on Ralston between 7:45 a.m. and 8:45 a.m. on weekdays when school is in session.

Commissioner Mayer:

- Enthusiastically supports the project.
- Would like to see more investigation into solar paneling.
- Happy to see that the landscape architect kept his favorite grotto. He had read that this was probably a part of the original building that was constructed there in the 1920's, and suggested that they might want to add a plaque depicting its history.

Commissioner Mercer:

- Convinced that between the Staff Report and the presentations all of her concerns have pretty much been addressed.
- Still concerned about the allocation of some of the parking spots.
- Convinced that her concern about bulk can now be mitigated adequately through the DDP.
- Had been concerned about depleting the City's rental units; the Staff Report convinced her that 20 units out of the City's stock of over 4,000 units is not going to be a problem.

- Had been very concerned that they retain a park-like, wooded entrance to Belmont and is now convinced that working through the DDP they will be able to do that.
- Convinced that they will be able to work together to come up with some answers for staging trucks, for getting all of these truck loads of dirt out of there in terms of working hours while school is in session and over the summer when school is not in session.
- Convinced that the uphill view looking down at the glare created by the white roofs is something they can look at in the DDP.
- Mr. Carter has raised a new concern – what are they going to do with all of the haul-off from the old building? Asked that staff and the applicant try to come up with something creative so that there is the maximum amount of recycling and – that they will not be putting the entire huge building in a landfill. CDD de Melo interjected that the City has a construction recycling ordinance that will be addressed as part of the DDP.

MOTION: By Vice Chair Frautschi, seconded by Commissioner Mayer, to adopt the Resolution recommending City Council adoption of a Mitigated Negative Declaration of Environmental Significance and Addendum for a General Plan Amendment, establishment of a Planned Development Zone, approval of a Lot Merger and Tentative Subdivision Map for a Condominium Conversion at 1000 South Road/950 Holly Road (Appl. No. 2006-0088).

Ayes: Frautschi, Mayer, Horton, Mercer, Parsons  
 Noes: None  
 Absent: McKenzie

Motion passed 5/0/1

MOTION: By Vice Chair Frautschi, seconded by Commissioner Horton, to adopt the Resolution recommending City Council adoption of a General Plan Amendment, establishment of a Planned Development Zone, Conceptual Development Plan, Lot Merger and a Tentative Subdivision Map for a Condominium Conversion at 1000 South Road/950 Holly Road (Appl. No. 2006-0088), with Exhibit "A," Performance Standards, Conceptual Development Plan, Rezone to Planned Development, and Tentative Subdivision Map for 1000 South Road/950 Holly Road (Appl. No. PA2006-0088)

Ayes: Frautschi, Horton, Myer, Mercer, Parsons  
 Noes: None  
 Absent: McKenzie

Motion passed 5/0/1

Chair Parsons announced that this item will be forwarded to the City Council.

Ms. Jansen, CDD de Melo and Chair Parsons expressed their appreciation for the cooperation of all parties involved, and look forward to completion of the project.

## 7. REPORTS, STUDIES AND UPDATES

CDD de Melo reported as follows:

### 7A. 500 Block – El Camino Real (East Side)

City staff continues to investigate the issue surrounding the removal of the trees along El Camino Real from Code Enforcement and Police Department perspectives.

### 7B. Motel 6 – 1101 Shoreway Road

Staff continues to work with the property owners relative to future development of the site and they are due in short order to come back with a summary of recent security activity.

### 7D. NDNU (Koret) Athletic Field

See discussion following item 5C above.

Commissioners Frautschi and Parsons had called his attention to some tree cutting on property on Old County Road and signage on the NDNU campus. He will probably be adding that to upcoming agendas.

Chair Parsons suggested follow-up on a previous discussion about the possibility of adding a bench at the bus stop at the corner of Hallmark and Ralston.

Commissioner Mercer commented that she was the liaison at the last City Council meeting where they discussed the building time limit. The discussion was continued for further study and ideas, but she believes it will proceed in some form or another. The concept was to put an upper curb on construction time limits from the date of pulling a permit, to prevent the 5% of these projects which drag on for 3-6 years.

CDD de Melo reminded the Commission that the Emmett House will be moved at 10:00 p.m. on January 22nd.

Commissioner Horton called staff's attention to the huge banners advertising Indulge and Chez Saigon restaurants.

Chair Parsons added that there are a lot of businesses on the left side of El Camino going north at Middle Road with banners.

RS Flores announced that the next Planning Commission meeting has been moved from February 5th, to Thursday, February 7th because of the election.

Chair Parsons reminded Commissioners that applications to reapply for the Planning Commission are due January 25th .

#### 8. CITY COUNCIL MEETING OF TUESDAY, JANUARY 22, 2008

Liaison: Commissioner Mayer  
Alternate Liaison: Chair Parsons

#### 9. ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting was adjourned at 10:15 p.m. to a Regular Planning Commission Meeting on Thursday, February 7, 2008 at 7:00 p.m. in Belmont City Hall. (Meeting date changed due to January 5, 2008 election.)

---

Carlos de Melo  
Planning Commission Secretary

CD's of Planning Commission Meetings are available in the  
Community Development Department.

Please call (650) 595-7416 to schedule an appointment.